

PAPERS FROM THE SOCIETY

FOR THE

Diffusion of Political Knowledge.

S. F. B. MORSE, Pres't. C. MASON, Cor. Sec., 13 Park Row, N. Y.

**Remarks of Mr. Brooks in the
House of Representatives,
March 7th.**

**The Biggest Deficiency Bill ever
known in the World's History.**

\$108,422,817.

Over 102 Millions beyond the Estimates.

**War against Napoleon cost only
\$906,000,000 in Six Years.**

WE SPEND \$1,000,000,000 IN A SINGLE YEAR.

Lawless Use of the Public Money.

**Thirty Millions to carry Elections under
the mock name of Transportation.**

Mr Brooks. Mr. Chairman, when the deficiency bill, then under seven millions, was before the House some time ago, I expressed my surprise at its magnitude, and referred to the estimates to show that the appropriations were far beyond what the Secretaries asked. I have none of those remarks to retract. I rise now to re-

mind the House that the objections I then made to this bill have greater force to the extraordinary additions made to this bill as it reaches us amended, that is, added to, by the Senate. The original estimates submitted to the House for deficiencies for the fiscal year ending the 30th of June, 1864, were only \$4,180,581 13. These were made up of estimates—

For civil list, foreign intercourse, and miscellaneous.....	\$1,317,371 13
For Interior Department, (Indian).....	4,210 00
For Navy Department.....	2,865,000 00

And here I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that though it must have been as well known then as now that the time of enlistment of a large body of our troops was about expiring, yet there was not a call for a dollar of "deficiency" from the War Department. The Secretary of War admitted, by his silence, that he had all the money he wanted. The Committee of Ways and Means, however, paid but little attention to the deficiency estimates of the Secretary of the Treasury, (\$4,180,581,) and the House of Representatives paid less, for both committee and House shot far beyond the original. As the bill went to the Senate it appropriated \$7,469,109 65. The Senate sent it back to us with additional appropriations for deficiencies of \$98,953,608. So the deficiency bill, as added to by the Senate, stands forward with the gigantic appropriation of \$106,424,718 22. The Committee of Ways and Means have amended that bill by striking out \$151,000, and the deficiency bill, as amended by the Committee of Ways and Means,

1864(2)

asks us to appropriate \$106,271,218. The table may be stated thus :

Amount contained in original (House) bill	\$7,469,109 65
Senate amendments thereto.....	98,953,608 75

Total.....	\$106,422,718 40
Amount inserted by Senate, in which the Committee of Ways and Means recommended non-concurrence.....	151,500 00

Total amount in bill as now reported. \$106,271,218 00

Mr. Stevens. The gentleman from New York will not fail to say that the Committee of Ways and Means do not ask that sum. That is the amount of the bill as returned from the Senate. The Committee of Ways and Means ask only about eight millions. All the remainder has been sent from the Senate. I will say to the gentleman that the committee have concluded to ask the House to non-concur in all the amendments of the Senate.

Mr. Brooks. I take the report of the action of the Committee of Ways and Means as annexed to the bill itself, in which they recommend concurrence in the first, second, fourth, fifth, sixth, sixth and a half, eighth, ninth, tenth, thirteenth, fourteenth, and sixteenth amendments of the Senate.

Mr. Stevens. That is so, but at a subsequent meeting of the Committee they thought it best to non-concur, if the House would agree to it.

Mr. Brooks. I am correct, then.

Mr. Stevens. Correct in reference to the first action of the committee.

Mr. Brooks—I am both pleased and amazed at the change of action now first announced upon the part of the Committee of Ways and Means. I am pleased because the idea of non-concurrence shows they are appalled with the magnitude of the Senate appropriations as well as so humble a member of the House as myself. But I am more than amazed that they propose to take from this House, by the simple proposition to non-concur, the deliberate and detailed action of the House upon these enormous expenditures, and abandon the constitutional powers and functions of this House to examine in detail all these amendments of the Senate, and to throw that whole power from us into the hands of a mere committee of conference to be appointed by the Chair. To non-concur with the Senate upon this bill in its present stage is to abandon all our right, all our authority, all our duty to examine the details of expenditures proposed by the action of the Senate, and to throw the whole discussion and deliberation, which justly belong to this House, exclusively into the hands of a committee of conference.

The result of such action has recently been seen on the whiskey bill. That bill was lost in this House by a large majority, defeated over and over again, the House having affirmed its intention to pass a retroactive law upon the stock of whiskey on hand; yet the House was by mere parliamentary action, or by the action of a committee of conference, deprived of its legitimate power to impose a retroactive duty, as it intended upon the stock on hand, and the Senate, by concurrence with the adhering action of the House, was enabled to pass the bill almost as originally intended by the Senate, despite all the resolves and re-resolves of the House.

I warn the House, therefore, in a bill of this enormous magnitude, disposing of over a hundred and five million dollars, not to abandon at this stage of the bill its legitimate function of examination in detail by bestowing it upon a mere committee of conference.

Mr. Colfax, (the Speaker.)—The gentleman will allow me to correct him as to a matter of fact. The reason why the bill did not have the retroactive feature in it when it finally passed, is because the House did not appoint a committee of conference at the last, but upon the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Stevens] adhered to its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate, and allowed the Senate to recede from its amendments, thus leaving the bill without the retroactive feature.

Of course the gentleman will be just to the Chair by saying that in each instance a majority of the members of the committee on the part of the House agreed in their votes with the majority of the House.

Mr. Brooks.—I was far from casting any imputation whatever upon the action of the Speaker. He fairly represented on the committee of conference the majority of the House. I was but showing that though the House had determined by forty majority to have the thing its own way, and repeated that determination over and over again by ten and fifteen majority, yet by parliamentary action the determination of the House was reversed and the bill passed without this retroactive feature.

Mr. Colfax.—It was because the House refused to raise another committee of conference, but under the operation of the rules voted an adherence. The Senate then receded, and the bill passed.

Mr. Stevens. The bill as it passed is precisely as the House agreed to it.

Mr. Brooks. I understand all that. I comprehend the parliamentary tactics, comprehended them at the time, and if I had not intended to vote with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I should have resisted his proposition. It is because he is the old parliamentarian that he is now taking, that he would still wish, if he could, to take, from the discussion and examination of this House the details of this bill by the action of a conference committee, by transferring the forum of discussion—

Mr. Dawes—The gentleman makes a mistake. The reason why we have not a tax upon whiskey on hand now, is not because of parliamentary tactics. There is no trace of parliamentary tactics about it, and a reference to the facts will show it. The House put a tax on whiskey on hand. The Senate struck that out as an amendment; it came back to the House, and the House concurred in that amendment; and the reason why there is no tax upon whiskey on hand today is because the majority of the House, in its legitimate functions, and in discharging its duty, without the aid or skill of my friend from Pennsylvania (Mr. Stevens) at all, concurred in the action of the Senate. It was done by the concurrent action of the two Houses, and not by any committee of conference; and that is the reason why there is no tax on whiskey on hand.

Mr. Brooks. I comprehend all that thoroughly.

Mr. Dawes. Then the gentleman has less excuse for misstating it.

Mr. Brooks. I comprehend it perfectly and do not misstate it. I will not take time to discuss this matter. I simply state the fact that this House, at one time by forty-four majority, and at other times by majorities of ten and twelve, resolved and re-resolved to tax the whiskey on hand, and the whiskey on hand is not taxed despite the resolution of the House. The country understands that, and we will not dispute about the ways and means by which it was done. I say it was parliamentary tactics and conference committees. Other gentlemen think differently. The great facts are before us: the *modus operandi* we will not dispute about.

Mr. Chairman, whiskey is an exciting and entrancing question, and I have been led altogether from the *figurative* speech I have on hand to the discussion of a far more exciting and thrilling topic than that of a mere bill of deficiencies.—But tempting as is the theme, I must recall the attention of the House, however, to the dryer topic which we have on hand, namely, this \$106,271,218 appropriation, as a Deficiency for the

fiscal year beginning July 1, 1863, and ending June 30, 1864.

I call the attention of the House first to the fact that in this deficiency bill there are for the War Department alone appropriations amounting to about ninety-nine millions, when at the beginning of the session, in the estimates submitted by the War Department through the Secretary of the Treasury, not one single cent was asked for by the Secretary of War for a deficiency in his appropriations. And yet now, when all the facts relating to deficiencies must have been just as well known to the Secretary of War in the beginning of the session; and now that Secretary comes before the Senate, and through the Senate before this House, without any estimates whatever being submitted to this House, and asks an additional appropriation of over ninety-eight millions to make up a deficiency in the appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1864.

Why, sir, the whole expenses of this Government in the year 1815, during the last war with Great Britain, that contest which this then comparatively feeble nation carried on with the greatest Power upon earth, were but \$48,244,495. The expenses of the Army for that war were, in 1813, \$19,562,013 02; in 1814, \$20,350,806 86; in 1815, \$14,794,294 22; and yet the deficiency asked for by the Secretary of War for one single year amounts to four and five times the cost of any one year of the war of 1812.

The whole appropriations of this Government in 1847-48, the years of the Mexican war, were but little over sixty millions per annum. The actual expenses of the War Department were, in 1847, \$35,776,495; in 1848, \$27,838,374. And that war, which was not upon our own soil, but was costly in the transfer of troops from our own country to a foreign country; that war, in which our troops, landing at Vera Cruz, passed on through the *tierra caliente*, the hot region of Mexico, to its mountains, to Churubusco and Chapultepec, on to the Garita of Mexico; that glorious war, in which we humbled Mexico and brought the Mexicans to our own terms, cost this Government but \$35,776,495, the highest sum in the year 1847; and yet here is a war deficiency bill of over ninety-eight millions for the War Department alone for one year, or over sixty-three millions beyond what the war with Mexico cost a year.

There is something wrong in all this; there must be something wrong; and hence the House should not abandon its functions, but should look

into these expenditures, and see when, how, and where this money has been appropriated, and where these enormous sums of money have gone, who have had them, in what quarters they have been paid, why they are called for, and what they are to effect. Sir, if these disbursements for the War Department are to go on for three, four, or five years longer, it will be beyond the power of this country or of any other country on the face of the earth to endure them.

The Secretary of War in his estimates for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1864, (see Treasury Report, page 30), asked for and had appropriated \$885,479,511. The Secretary of the Treasury, when he submitted that report to Congress, felt sure in his own mind that \$885,479,511 was ample and enough for all the expenditures of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1864, and hence not a single cent additional was then called for either by the Secretary of the Treasury or by the Secretary of War himself. And yet here in February and March we propose to add to this already appropriated sum of \$885,479,511, a deficiency in this bill of \$98,500,000. What calculations are all these? Can man thus carry on war, or provide the men and means for carrying on war?

More than that. Recall a little of the past history of our legislation during this session. At an early period of the session, before the Christmas holidays, there went through this House, in twenty minutes by the clock, a deficiency of \$20,000,000 for bounties—a million a minute—uncalled for by the Secretary of War, or by the Secretary of the Treasury in his estimate. I made some quiet remarks on that occasion. I called the attention of the other side of the House to the subject, but I found that my remarks were not pleasant to the other side, and I refrained from discussing the subject at length, leaving the responsibility with those to whom it belonged.

In a few days after the Christmas holidays, the Secretary of War called upon us to change that bounty appropriation of \$20,000,000, and in a very few minutes, opposed only by an honorable gentleman from Ohio, on the other side, there went quietly through a bill for bounties, which I said then had in it \$100,000,000. Now, under the continuance of the bounty system to April 1, that bill has in it at least \$124,000,000 to be added to the estimate of the Secretary of War. Take not my word for it. I quote from the Chairman of the Military Committee in the Senate (Mr. Wilson):

"I suppose that we have, since the 17th October, paid and agreed to pay for these bounties from ninety to one hundred million dollars. It must be over ninety millions, for we have paid bounties, I think, to very near three hundred thousand men. * * *

"I suppose if the payment of these bounties is extended and we go on raising men at the rate we are now raising them, that we shall raise during the coming month somewhere from sixty to eighty thousand men, paying a portion of them \$400, and another portion \$300."

Which, counting seventy thousand men at the average of \$350 per man, will make \$24,500,000; so that if you take the actual expenditures and appropriations of the Department as now put upon paper as recorded in the Treasury report, at \$885,479,511, add to that \$98,500,000 deficiency and \$120,000,000 for bounty, there will have been appropriated for the War Department of this Government alone, for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1864, the gigantic sum of \$1,108,979,511.

Mr. Kellogg, of Michigan. I wish to correct the gentleman in one respect, if he will permit me.

Mr. Brooks. Certainly.

Mr. Kellogg, of Michigan. The payment of these bounties is extended over the whole term of enlistment, and only a small portion is to be expended this year.

Mr. Brooks. Not a small portion—a considerable portion.

Mr. Kellogg, of Michigan. One fourth, I think.

Mr. Brooks. What I am speaking about is the appropriations for this year. I do not suppose that the bounties will be all expended in the year.

Mr. Kellogg, of Michigan. About a fourth of the moneys to be expended in bounties will be expended this year.

Mr. Brooks. More than that. But, nevertheless, it is the sum of money appropriated that I am speaking of—the appropriations of Congress for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1864. The more money that is saved the better; but all these bounties are to be paid in some time or other.

I hold in my hand a record of the expenses of the British army from 1810 to 1816, in each year—those terrible years of struggle in which the little island of Great Britain and the lesser isle of Ireland were coping against the gigantic power of Napoleon, who had taken the French armies in triumph from the sands of Egypt to the snows of Moscow—that little island which was subsidizing all the other powers of Europe to fight her battles against that mighty Napoleon.—The expenditures in the British army in the year

1810 were \$34,415,000; and in 1816, on the closing scenes of the battle of Waterloo, they were \$171,035,000. The aggregate expenditures for the seven years from 1810 to 1816 inclusive, were \$906,730,000. The details were thus:

Expenditures of the British army in the years—

1810.....	\$34,415,000
1811.....	90,680,000
1812.....	119,345,000
1813.....	124,935,000
1814.....	147,345,000
1815.....	168,975,000
1816.....	171,035,000

Total.....\$906,730,000

But, sir, for the single fiscal year of 1863-64, we, who are coping with no Napoleon, with no combination of powers for our overthrow—but with a few rebellious States, starting without resources and full of all the elements of weakness, we have appropriated more money in a single year to subdue the rebellion than was appropriated for the whole British empire in the six years from 1810 to 1816 to subdue the august Napoleon, at one time combining all the continental nations of Europe for British overthrow.

I do not allude to these things for the purpose of creating alarm or exciting the fears of the country, only to arouse the country to comprehend the magnitude of this war, and to begin now to lay the necessary taxation to support it, so that we may not in the future find ourselves unable to sustain the credit of the country. That is my object and intention in calling the attention of the House to the enormous expenditures of the War Department.

A thousand million dollars per annum, Mr. Chairman, a billion dollars—I do not know how it is with others,—but I must confess that to my humble mind these sums are so appalling that I can hardly begin to comprehend their gigantic magnitude when we are called upon to transmit them to our children as a public debt. I confess that I often turn back to the olden times in the history of this Government. I was here in this House at a time when the expenditure by this Government of forty-four, forty-six, or forty-eight millions was regarded as an enormous extravagance, and that was not long ago, in 1849-50, 1851-52. I recollect when the then chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, then an honorable gentleman from Alabama, well known to the present chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, educated in a country where cotton even was not raised, but in northern Alabama, where corn and wheat were the productions, and where a dollar was estimated by the price of a bushel of corn or the price of a bushel of wheat—

I recollect well how appalled he was at the enormous magnitude of the expenditure by this Government of forty-four, forty-six, or forty-eight million dollars. Indeed, he had a mind so constituted that members who served with him upon the floor of the House will remember that he could not comprehend anything above half a million dollars. Whenever a sum came up in our appropriations of as much as a hundred thousand dollars he was wont to be confused, but when it ran up to half a million dollars he would often abandon his appropriation bill and exclaim, "Good God, what is the country coming to?" Why, sir, if he was here this day he would be lost in inextricable confusion by these enormous appropriations for the War Department only.

Indeed, we in the great cities who are somewhat accustomed to figures, and who represent millionaires, will soon be compelled, if these expenditures go on, to bring to our aid something more than mere arithmetic, the science of geometry or mensuration say, and measure a million by an inch, a billion by two inches, a trillion by three inches, a quadrillion by four inches, a quintillion by five inches, and so on, or if that does not present numeration or measurement sufficient to enable us to understand these sums, we shall have to resort to the science of algebra, apply x as an unknown quantity of expenditure, and work with that. An equation may be stated thus: $AB - [CD \times EF = XYZ = LMNOPQ$. [Laughter.]

Sir, it is becoming beyond the power of arithmetic or the power of simple mathematics to compute these appropriations, or to understand the loans or systems of loans on which they are being founded. The whole concern anon will be more puzzling than the consols or exchequers in the debt of England.

The estimates of the War Department for 1865 are, in round numbers, \$536,000,000. Sir, it is evident from these appropriations for 1863-64 we are now making that if this war is to continue these estimates for 1865 are not worth the paper they are written upon, for the actual expenditure of the present fiscal year for 1864 of the War Department will amount to almost if not quite a thousand million dollars—certainly, if we pay up the war warrants of the quartermasters, their certificates of obligation, and the great debts now due to the States for money and troops advanced to the Federal Government for military services rendered.

Now, Mr. Chairman, is it right, is it proper, is it a legitimate mode of coming before the country with an estimate in December of only \$4,180,581 deficiency, and then before the bill is perfected require, as sanctioned by the Senate, a deficiency of over \$106,000,000? I repeat, sir, is it right or just to the country thus to throw dust in their eyes? Is it not wise, is it not now our duty at the start to look this war with all its consequences fully in the face and to provide for this enormous expenditure and these enormous appropriations the only means by which, if the war is to be persisted in, the credit of the country can be sustained, a system of taxation which shall be proportionate to our expenditure? Is it just for us to leave for posterity the full payment of these loans? Sir, under a concordant Cabinet, or any unit administration of the Government, these discords between estimates and appropriations could not occur. But every Secretary we see now "runs his own machine." The Secretary of State runs his, and thrusts in appropriations for lawless foreign missions; the Secretary of War runs his, and thrusts in over ninety-eight millions of deficiencies, two months after he says he has enough in the annual appropriations; the Secretary of the Navy runs his; while the Secretary of the Treasury, the victim of all, because he has to find paper money for all, runs his printing machines, and his presidential machine, one and all. Is it any wonder that under such an administration of the Government we are annually spending more money to subdue a few million starving Rebels than Great Britain spent in six years to bring down the world-wandering eagles of the great Napoleon?

I availed myself on a former opportunity to denounce this whole system of deficiency bills. I showed that appropriations were made without law. I exhibited in this bill, and it is here reproduced, the creation of four hundred and forty odd clerks utterly without law. I showed the creation of a foreign mission by the Secretary of State without law.

The recklessness of law has become so rife among the Departments that even the Commissioner of Agriculture turns up in this bill in the most extraordinary demand for a deficiency.—When we have deficiencies in the Departments it is not to be wondered at that the Commissioner of Agriculture comes before Congress and tells it that he has purchased things without law for which he must have an appropriation. I find in the Senate amendments the following:

To supply deficiencies in the Department of Agriculture for the current year, as follows:
For the purchase of sorghum seed \$2,000.
For rebuilding shop in the propagating garden, \$800
For postage, \$1,320.
For carpets, furniture, cans for fruit \$350.
For fuel, \$300.

This is the farcical part of the bill. I allude to it not in resistance to the purchase of these humble matters, for seed may do some good to the country, while appropriations for this war are all lost except as they may serve to restore the Union. This gentleman with the illustrious name, in a letter to the Finance Committee of the Senate, says:

"The destructive frosts of last autumn in a large part of the West rendered entirely worthless many important seeds which I have been called upon to supply, chief of which is the sorghum, now becoming one of the most important crops in the country. In several of the large States the seed was so generally destroyed that I have felt obliged, at the urgent call of the farmers, to send abroad for a fresh supply of pure seed."

Great sorghum-seed seller!

"An increasing belief among the people in the feasibility of producing an excellent article of silk from the ailanthus silkworm, and repeated inquiries for the means of its production, have led me to order a large quantity of cocoons from France, where it has proved a perfect success."

Importer of cocoons!

"An extensive failure of the corn crops, with other causes, has created a great demand for new and different varieties of wheat for both fall and spring sowing, which has been met by importations from England, Russia, and the Mediterranean, and by purchases of improved varieties of American growth."

Great wheat-seed dealer!

"The very great and increasing interest in the culture of the grape, and the consequent demand for vines, has induced a large increase in the expenses of the propagating garden."

Vines for the propagating garden! Well, well! All this in a deficiency bill. What next may we be coming to?

The Commissioner of the Department of Agriculture gives no excuse for his lawless purchase of carpet, furniture, and cans for fruit, except that he has expended the money, and wants an appropriation for it!

This is a mere farce. It is not worthy of notice, except to show that the higher officers of the Government, by the creation of foreign missions, by enormous expenditures, without law, have induced the Commissioner of Agriculture to purchase canned fruit, sorghum seed, carpet, and furniture, all in humble imitation of the higher powers that thus act without law.

But there are other appropriations in this bill, which are far from being farcical, and which may be termed tragical. To these I call the attention of the House. The quartermaster comes before the country, and asks for \$25,000,000 deficiency for additional transportation for the Army for the fiscal year ending the 30th of June, 1864. The Senate have increased that, and increased it

to \$30,000,000 in the bill now before the House. The Quartermaster General says :

"This deficiency is caused by the activity of movement of the armies, the great expense of the transportation of the army operating against Vicksburg, the transfer of army corps from the army of the Potomac to the division of the Mississippi, the Texas expedition, the transportation furnished to veteran volunteers to and from their homes, furloughed or re-enlisting, and the purchase of transports."

But the Quartermaster General has not told the whole truth. These \$30,000,000 deficiencies have also been made necessary by the transportation of troops to influence and carry elections in the country. If we could have the details of these quartermaster expenditures the House would find that a large part of this new deficiency was created in the expense of the transportation of a regiment or two to New Hampshire a year ago to carry the election in that State. If we could have a history of the transportation of troops we would find that several regiments and portions of regiments supposed to be favorable to the dominant party were carried to and fro to vote at the expense of the Government. There has been transportation of the Army solely to execute the purposes of the party in power.

If we could have the history of the transportation of the Army, we would find that a large number of troops selected for being favorable to the Administration party were sent last October and November to New York, Pennsylvania, or to the Western States, and afterwards to Maryland and Delaware to carry the election there. There is where the deficiency of \$30,000,000 reported by the Committee of Ways and Means is mainly due. It is due to the efforts of the War Department to carry the elections of the country. There is where the money has gone. It is not for the legitimate expenditures of this war; it is not for the capture, overthrow, and destruction of the rebel army, and it is not to plant the stars and stripes upon the capitol hill of Richmond, or on the forts of Mobile and Charleston; but it is to subdue the Democracy, the conservative power of New Hampshire, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and of the great West; in short, to overawe by arms before the ballot boxes the people of the country. I denounce it with all the vigor and power of which I am capable. Here and hereafter, will I denounce it, and I appeal from the majority of this House to the God of Heaven to put the mark of reprobation upon these wicked and criminal acts; I appeal to the genius of liberty which has so long hovered over and protected this hitherto

blessed country to overthrow the party in power, that thus illegitimately perverts the valor and the generosity and the patriotism of a great people to overthrow their free institutions. I appeal to history and to posterity to brand with everlasting infamy the men who thus bring arms into elections, and who with the cartridge-box trample the ballot-box under foot. I know I shall not be heard or heeded on the floor of this House; but the brand of history and the curse of posterity will be the just doom of all these destroyers of the liberties of their country.

Mr. Morris, of New York, I would like to inquire of my colleague whether it would not be less expensive to let the soldiers of New York vote in the Army than to send them home?

Mr. Brooks. I do not choose now to be drawn into that discussion.

I voted for this first deficiency bill of \$7,000,000. I voted for it not cheerfully, but because in time of war it seemed necessary to be generous, extravagant, if you please, in generosity. I have voted for all the appropriation bills which have gone from this House, but I am going to leave this bill to be voted for by such as approve these Quartermaster deficiencies in it. Some time since it was remarked by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Davis] in good Virgilian Latin, that the times "did not need help from this side of the House or such helpers as we are." I am disposed to accept him and his friends at his word—to let them pass this large deficiency bill. As for myself, I shall not vote a single dollar as a deficiency for transportation for the Army until this transporting of the military to carry the elections is disproved. Those who favor such an appropriation as this must and shall vote for it. As for myself I never will take the responsibility of voting for a single cent of it, and in justification of my course upon this subject I shall appeal to the public, whom I desire to bear in mind that this House has not before it a single item of legitimate estimate for any of these deficiencies and appropriations. The Committee of Ways and Means may have had them, but the House has not got them. There has been no inquiry what the expenditures have been in New England, in the Northern States, in Maryland, and in the Western States, and until we have a detail of these expenditures for election purposes, if not a single other-vote is given against this bill, I shall on this deficiency bill, with the greatest pleasure with which I have given any vote in my life, vote "No."

**How an Additional Loan of 11 Millions
of Dollars was Created without
Law, and how \$444,000 in Pre-
miums were Pocketed by
Corruptionists from it.**

[*Remarks of Mr. Brooks upon the Items in the Civil Bill, Appropriating Considerable Sums for Treasury "Contingencies"*]

Let us strike all of them out, (said Mr. Brooks.) I move to strike them out. The Treasury has no need for appropriations for Contingencies,—for the way in which it is now managed, it can be made a self-supporting institution.

Sir,—we were called upon here, in this Hall, a few days ago,—as if it would now seem, in utter mockery, to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to issue Eleven Millions of additional 5-20 Bonds,—beyond the \$500,000,000 before authorized by law. We went through all the mock forms of Legislation,—as if we had been real *bona fide* men, with brains as well as bodies, to thus authorize the Secretary to exceed this Five Hundred Million act by Eleven Million more. We were told, gravely told,—that it was indispensably necessary to give the Secretary this authority, because nearly \$11,000,000 had been bid for beyond the amount sanctioned by Law, and that he could not distinguish these real late bids, from antecedent bids on the authorized Loan. The House gave the Secretary what he asked for,—but judge of what tools were made of us, when, by the March 1st Report of the Debt of the Treasury, we find that the Secretary even then had issued over \$510,000,000 of the Loan, Ten Million beyond the Law,—and beyond the authority, which in this Congress was not given him till March 4th or 5th!

Now, sir, let us look into this transaction. Let us calculate the profits of it, and ask who got these profits. These Eleven Millions of additional 5-20's were worth, March 4th, from 107 to 108 premium,—that is to say, for every one hundred dollars thus loaned, the Government could have got in the New York market a premium of \$108. The profit, hence, was not altogether that, because there was an accruing interest of about 3 per cent., so that the profit only was but 4 per cent. Now this premium profit of 104 for 100 on Eleven Millions of additional stock was worth \$444,000 to somebody. Who has it? Where has it gone? It is not pretended that it is in the Treasury, or if it is there, it pays ten times over all these contingencies for the Treasury, in this bill, and therefore we need not vote a single cent of appropriation to provide for them. I know, sir, full well, where these \$444,000 have gone,—not exactly into whose hands,—but into what class of hands,—into the hands of Pet Brokers, who surround and envelope the Treasury, and fatten and gorge upon the miseries of their country and their countrymen. These \$444,000 premiums have been thrown away upon favorites, and thrown away when the country is suffering in all the agonies of war. All I can do, Mr. Chairman, is here on the floor of this House, as a representative of the people, to expose and denounce such transactions. All I can do is to make a record of them for the people, and for the Historian hereafter,—as a specimen of the corruption and fraud of the times. I discharge my duty—but it is now all in vain. No man now can be heard or heeded, amid the corruptions that surround this capital.